

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SEARCHED			
Class	Sub.	Date	Exmr.
427	554	9/19/94	1/1/99
	555		
	556		
	581		
	582		
	583		
	584		
	586		
	596		
	597		
156	643		

update

\*\*\*

During an interview with applicant on the Continuation Case 09/20/92 (con 6/24/93), it was learned that the Yamazaki et al refile P.N. 4786, 3585. While having no overlapping inventors from the SAME assignee, hence regardless of interpretation issues, this application should have either a double patenting or a Judicial D.P. rejection.

Mr. Paul Gott

9/16

43

7/25

33 Reply Brief dated 8-25-98  
34 Information Disclosure Statement

REMAND TO EXAMINER MAR 18 1993

35 4/13/99  
36 Letter  
37 IDS 12/16/99  
38 Remand to Examiner 1/11/2000  
39 Letter (in writing) 2-23-00  
40 Hearing (4.13.00) 5.15.00  
41 Confirmation 4.18.00  
42 Supplement to paper T.D. 5.12.00  
43 Hearing 1.16.01

SEARCH NOTES

	Date	Exmr.
The claims of this case are unrelated to those of parent 07/84/907 as of 9/4/93	9/4/93	
ordered patent file for Yamazaki et al (a main ref) 4,786,358 to check logic error in claims (#15) was not a printer error - as its in the claim as originally filed		
discussed 4/19/99, Transmittal of (45) with 15 Main should not be considered a new IDS 5/23/00		

43. Remand to Examiner May 5, 2000

44 Letter H.C. 6/1/00  
45 IDS 12.10.99  
46 Letter 7-19-00  
47 Change of Address 7/27/00  
48 Hearing 1.16.01  
49 Confirmation 11.6.00  
50 Remand To Examiner 2/23/01  
51 ~~Letter~~ Re: 3 8.4.01  
52 ~~Letter~~ Re: 2 2/26/02  
53 Amended F.N.E. 2/26/02  
54 Non-Compliant Amended 4/4/02  
55 Amended 4/23/02

56 Interview Summary 7/1/02  
57 ~~Information Disclosure~~ Statement 7/1/02